

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Netscan (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021001103129/netscan.research.microsoft.com/Static/Default.asp>), hereinafter “Netscan.” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following remarks.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 4-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

In the October 30, 2007 Office Action, the Office asserted that claims 1 and 4-22 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Office objects to the limitation “... which is unrelated to a content of information posted...” Applicants respectfully disagree, but in order to further prosecution, Applicant have followed the suggestion in the January 25, 2008

Advisory Action and have amended the claims to cancel this limitation. As such, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the October 30, 2007 Office Action, the Office further objected to the term “appropriate group” in claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 as a relative term which allegedly renders the claim indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 to delete the limitation “appropriate” from those claims. In the January 25, 2008 Advisory Action, the Office has indicated that this amendment has overcome the rejection, and therefore Applicant assumes that this rejection has been withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 and 4-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, including determining and categorizing collaborative spaces based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space.

As suggested by the Office in the January 25, 2008 Advisory Action, Applicant has amended the claims to further define how the “categorization” is performed in the claimed invention. (Support for this Amendment can be found in the specification at paragraphs [0025-0028].) Claim 1, as amended, states that the collaborative space is categorized based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space:

1. A computer-implemented method for analyzing a collaborative space, comprising:
 - analyzing the collaborative space by measuring interactivity metrics between users of the collaborative space to determine the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space; and
 - categorizing the collaborative space into one of a plurality of groups based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space;

recommending the collaborative space from a group of collaborative spaces to a potential user based on desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user, wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures the nature and type of interactivity between users in the collaborative space.

Therefore, a collaborative space is analyzed to determine the nature and type of interactivity, *e.g.*, how a user interacts with that space. This can include, for example, an analysis of how quickly responses to questions are posted, the percentage of first responses that occur within the first day of postings, and participation analyses such as the percentage of users who only create new postings, the percentage of users who only respond to postings, or the percentage of users that both create and respond to postings. The foregoing examples are provided merely for illustrative purposes only, as claim 1 is by no means limited to the examples provided.

In contrast, the Netscan system simply lists all of the collaborative spaces in a modified order based on, among other things, the “number of replies.” Simply determining how many replies have been made is not equivalent to determining the “nature and type of interactivity” within a collaborative space. Thus, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 8 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 8 recites:

8. A computer-implemented method for analyzing collaborative spaces, comprising:

analyzing a plurality of collaborative spaces by measuring interactivity metrics between users of the plurality of collaborative spaces to determine the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space;

categorizing the plurality of collaborative spaces into one of a plurality of groups based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space;

receiving desired interactivity metrics from a potential user of the plurality of collaborative spaces, wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures the nature and type of interactivity between users in each one of the plurality of collaborative spaces; and

recommending at least one of the categorized plurality of collaborative spaces from a group of collaborative spaces to the potential user based on the desired interactivity metrics.

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Netscan set forth above, Netscan does not disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 8, including the limitation of determining and categorizing collaborative spaces based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space.

In view of the foregoing, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Netscan, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan be withdrawn.

Claim 13 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 13 recites:

13. A computer implemented system having at least one computer for analyzing a collaborative space,-including:

a metric analysis system for analyzing a plurality of collaborative spaces by measuring interactivity metrics between users of the collaborative spaces to determine the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space;

a categorization system for categorizing the plurality of collaborative spaces into one of a plurality of groups based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space; and

a recommendation system for recommending at least one of the categorized plurality of collaborative spaces from a group of collaborative spaces to a potential user based on desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user, wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures the nature and type of interactivity between users in each one of the plurality of collaborative spaces.

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Netscan set forth above, Netscan does not disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 13, including the limitation of determining and categorizing collaborative spaces based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space.

In view of the foregoing, claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Netscan, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan be withdrawn.

Claim 18 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 18 recites:

18. A program product stored on a recordable medium for analyzing a collaborative space, which when executed comprises:
program code for analyzing a plurality of collaborative spaces by measuring interactivity metrics between users of the collaborative spaces to determine the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space;
program code for categorizing the plurality of collaborative spaces into one of a plurality of groups based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space; and
program code for recommending at least one of the categorized plurality of collaborative spaces from a group of collaborative spaces to a potential user based on desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user, wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures the nature and type of interactivity between users in each one of the plurality of collaborative spaces.

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Netscan set forth above, Netscan does not disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 18, including the limitation of determining and categorizing collaborative spaces based on the nature and type of interactivity within the collaborative space.

In view of the foregoing, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Netscan, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Netscan be withdrawn.

With respect to all of the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

In order to further clarify the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention, and to further efficient prosecution, Applicant requests an interview with the Examiner before the issuance of the next Office Action.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Meghan Q. Toner/
Meghan Q. Toner
Reg. No.: 52,142

Date: January 30, 2008

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)